

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

Christian Taylor,

Petitioner,

v.

Director, J. Reuben Long Detention Center,

Respondent.

Case No. 2:25-cv-02758-RMG

**ORDER AND OPINION**

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (R&R) of the Magistrate Judge recommending that Petitioner's habeas petition be summarily dismissed without prejudice and without requiring Respondent to file a return. (Dkt. No. 10). Petitioner did not file objections to the R&R. For the reasons set forth below, the Court adopts the R&R as the Order of the Court.

**I. Background**

Petitioner is a state pretrial detainee alleging excessive bond in relation to several pending criminal charges against him before the Horry County Court of General Sessions. (Dkt. No. 1). The Magistrate Judge ordered that Petitioner bring his case into proper form on April 17, 2025. (Dkt. No. 3). That order was returned to the Court as undeliverable on May 19, 2025, noting that Petitioner had been released from J. Reuben Long Detention Center. (Dkt. No. 6). Petitioner has not provided the Court with a new mailing address nor made any filings since his April 1, 2025 petition.

**II. Legal Standard**

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court is charged with making

a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

### III. Discussion

On review of the record, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge ably determined that dismissal of Petitioner’s case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) warranted for failure to prosecute. The Court further finds that summary dismissal is warranted where Petitioner’s case meets all three criteria for abstention under *Younger*. (Dkt. No. 10 at 2-4).

### IV. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, Petitioner’s case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without requiring Respondent to file a return.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Richard M. Gergel  
Richard Mark Gergel  
United States District Judge

June 17, 2025  
Charleston, South Carolina